

The appropriators from both sides of the aisle continue to have good discussions, and I hope on the funding of the government that the final agreement can be announced soon.

Now, the other two priorities, unfortunately, are a bit murkier. Yesterday, President Trump issued over Twitter a renewed threat on the annual Defense bill. Previously, the President threatened to veto this important legislation over a provision to rename military installations named after Confederate traitors.

Now President Trump has issued a veto threat by tweet over a policy concerning social media companies, section 230, which is in neither version of the NDAA already passed by both Houses of Congress.

President Trump must have realized that vetoing a pay raise for our troops in order to defend the honor of Confederate traitors wasn't the best message to send, so he has found a new complaint. After 4 years of ignoring the President's most vitriolic, conspiracy-fueled, and absurd comments on social media, I wonder if our Republican colleagues would say that they didn't see this particular tweet.

The truth is, section 230 may actually need some reform, but that is a serious undertaking that should be done in a regular order and can be left for another day, and it is certainly not an acceptable reason to veto the annual Defense bill, which includes policies to keep our military prepared, well-resourced, and equipped to do a difficult and vital job.

Nevertheless, it is silly season at the White House. The President seems intent on filling each of his remaining days in office with petulance, grievance, and self-interest.

The President is reportedly asking his staff about whether he can issue preemptive pardons for himself, his family members, and Rudy Giuliani. There is a simple answer: No. No, Mr. President, that would be a gross abuse of the Presidential pardon authority. But I have a more important question: Just how long are our Republican colleagues going to indulge the President in this nonsense?

Many of our Republican colleagues gave the President space to contest the validity of our elections, poisoning Americans' faith in our democracy. Now he is threatening to veto a pay raise for our troops and considering preemptively pardoning the entire Trump family. When are our Republican colleagues in the Senate going to say "Enough already"?

At the very least, with respect to the Defense bill, Senate Republicans ought to find the courage to ignore the President's eleventh hour ramblings and pass the NDAA.

#### CORONAVIRUS RELIEF

Madam President, now, regarding another COVID bill, we seem to be caught in a familiar pattern. We all know that successfully passing legislation through Congress means that a bill

must get through the Democratic House and get Democratic votes in the Senate.

Passing the law takes a measure of bipartisanship and compromise. That is why Speaker PELOSI and I sent the Republican leader a new offer on the COVID bill. It was an effort to jumpstart serious negotiations, but, yesterday, Leader MCCONNELL announced that rather than respond to our offer or the bipartisan offer of the so-called Gang of 8, he will pursue another partisan proposal before the end of the year. He said he was going to talk to the Republican leader in the House, the Republican President, and that is it—not a word with Democrats.

From early reports in the press, the latest Republican offer will be even more insufficient than the previous two attempts—so insufficient, that according to one press report, a Republican Senator said it was "offensive"—his word—to struggling Americans for the Republican majority to focus on another messaging bill.

Apparently, the latest Republican proposal will not include another dime of unemployment assistance because, according to the Republican whip, it was likely something the President wouldn't sign.

Let's be clear. The latest Republican offer on COVID will include immunity for corporations that put their workers at risk of COVID-19 but not a dime for workers who lost their jobs because of the pandemic.

The Republican leader should not waste the Senate's time on another inadequate, partisan proposal and, instead, sit down with Democrats to begin a true bipartisan effort to quickly meet the needs of the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hauptman nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 245 Ex.]

#### YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sinema
Cotton	King	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Perdue	

#### NAYS—39

Baldwin	Feinstein	Peters
Bennet	Gillibrand	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—5

Harris	McSally	Schatz
Loeffler	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kathryn C. Davis, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kathryn C. Davis, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?